



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/667,718	09/22/2000	Hyun Chang Lee	8733.270	9395

30827 7590 08/26/2004

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K STREET, NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

ALPHONSE, FRITZ

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2133

13

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/667,718

Applicant(s)

LEE ET AL.

Examiner

Fritz Alphonse

Art Unit

2133

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-12, 14-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 13 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 September 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☒ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-5, 8, 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tanaka (U.S. Pat. No. 5,900,852).

As to claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 15-17 Tanaka (figs. 4, 8, 12) show a method of driving a liquid crystal display device having a plurality of liquid crystal cells disposed in a matrix of rows and columns (i.e., note matrix LCD panel 11; col. 12, lines 7), the method comprising: scanning the rows of liquid crystal cells in the liquid crystal display device sequentially (col. 13, lines 34-40; col.14, lines 61-64). Tanaka teaches resetting each liquid crystal cell of the liquid crystal display device simultaneously (col. 24, lines 13-16).

As to claims 3 and 8, Tanaka (figs. 4, 8, 12) shows a method, wherein resetting each liquid crystal cell of the liquid crystal display device simultaneously comprises simultaneously applying a reset voltage to a gate electrode line of each liquid crystal cell.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2133

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 6, 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka in view of Bird (U.S. Pat. No. 5,852,425).

As to claim 6 and 9, Tanaka discloses a reset circuit for a liquid crystal display. Tanaka does not apply a common voltage to a common electrode.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Bird (figs. 1 and 6a) teaches about voltage selecting means for selecting, in response to an input control signal, a normal common voltage ( $V_e$  high) to be applied to a common electrode of the liquid crystal display device in an interval when a data voltage is charged and maintained in all liquid crystal cells of the liquid crystal display, and for selecting, in response to the input control signal, a reset voltage  $V_e$  (zero volt) less than the normal common voltage to be applied to the common electrode in a reset interval (reset voltage is  $V_e$  (zero volt), then the common voltage  $V_e$  high applied at the same time as the data charging time, i.e.  $V_e$  high  $>$   $V_e$  reset; see fig. 6a).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine Tanaka's LCD device with the active matrix display, as disclosed by Bird. Doing so would provide a display device for operating with digital video signals in which the data signal drive circuit can be simplified and operable at high speeds (col. 1, lines 51-54).

5. Claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka in view of Yanagi (U.S. Pat. No. 6,310,616).

Art Unit: 2133

As to claim 10 and 11, Tanaka discloses a reset circuit for a liquid crystal display device.

Tanaka does not disclose a voltage amplifier for amplifying an input control signal to a common electrode of the liquid crystal display device and, wherein the voltage amplifier outputs a normal common electrode voltage in an interval when a data voltage is charged and maintained in the liquid crystal cells, and outputs a reset voltage less than the normal common electrode voltage in the reset interval.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Yanagi (Prior Art figs. 48, 49) show a voltage amplifier for amplifying an input control signal to a common electrode driver (500; see figure 48) of the liquid crystal display device. See column 1, lines 50-67.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine Tanaka's LCD device with the drive circuit for a display device, as disclosed by Yanagi. Doing so would amplify the input control signal line and increase the brightness of the display.

6. Claims 12, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanbe (U.S. Pat. No. 6,151,016) in view of Matsushima (U.S. Pat. No. 6,396,468).

As to claims 12 and 14, Kanabe (fig. 19) shows a reset circuit for a liquid crystal display device, comprises OR-Gates (103), reset (erase) gate lines 25 (fig. 2); see col. 17, lines 48-55 and col. 18, lines 1-6. Kanabe teaches level shifters (102) outputting to OR-Gates 103 (claim calls for output of OR-Gates input to level shifters).

Kanbe does not explicitly disclose level shifters connected individually to outputs of the logical OR gates.

Art Unit: 2133

However, in the same field of endeavor, Matsushima teaches logic gates (NAND gates 1024 (fig. 6) of MUX 3b (fig. 4)) having input to level shifter 3c (fig. 4), see also col. 11, lines 67 to col. 12, line 2.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to improve upon the erasing device for LCD, as disclosed by Kanabe. Doing so would provide an erasing device for a LCD image which can erase an afterimage quickly while suppressing the deterioration of the liquid crystal, and to provide a LCD device including such an erasing device.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

7. Claim 13 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1-6, 8-12, 14-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### ***Conclusion***

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fritz Alphonse, whose telephone number is (703) 308-8534. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30-6:00, Alt. Mondays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert De Cady, can be reached at (703) 305-9595.

Art Unit: 2133

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Information regarding the status of an application may also be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Fritz Alphonse

Art Unit 2133

August 23, 2004

  
ALBERT DESCHAMPS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100